

other, and none unequivocally true. The equations of Aspasia (in the minor dialogue *Menexenus*) and Pamphile (and of Diotima and Isis, which is more justified) are less convincing, and Lucius, although he is curious about magic, never really becomes a magician, as O'B. claims, and is only afraid of being taken for one. O'B. ties in the novel-genre of the *Metamorphoses* with the lower, fictional discourse, which is responsible for some of the contradictions in the story. Even after the encounter with Isis, Lucius' discourse remains on the lower, sublunar level, unless he communicates with Isis wordlessly, which lifts him as much as possible in a novel to the higher form of discourse. Ch. 4, on *Cupid and Psyche*, deals with the interpretation of the myth as a Platonic allegory, with Cupid, Psyche, and her sisters resembling, but not being, allegories of the tripartite soul, and the integration of Platonic thought into the literary texture of a fictional work.

O'B. ingeniously argues that Apuleius uses his Platonic knowledge to illustrate a funny story, giving it literary though not philosophical depth, not really leaving the lower discourse in the novel because of its fictional genre. O'B. has some interesting things to say about the importance of discourse in the novel (the ass is unable to communicate through words, and retransformed Lucius can praise Isis only insufficiently in words). A clearer exploration of how this theory impacts on our view of Isis, especially since *Cupid and Psyche*, as widely accepted, is a *mise en abyme* of the whole novel, and how Isis calls for the higher kind of discourse within the constraints of fiction would have been desirable, but overall, O'B.'s subtle approach which combines Apuleian entertainment and Platonic philosophy, and a serious Platonic statement with the obvious problem that Apuleius' heroes do not live up to Platonic expectations, provides some effective illumination of the novel.

University of Durham

REGINE MAY

E. PLUMER, *AUGUSTINE'S COMMENTARY ON GALATIANS. INTRODUCTION, TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Pp. xvii + 294. ISBN 0-19-924439-1. £50.00.

Augustine's commentary on Paul's letter to the Galatians (henceforth: *Commentary*) is his only complete commentary on any book of the Bible. What makes it an interesting subject, in addition, is the fact that we have the texts of five other commentaries on Galatians by five different authors which belong to the last third of the fourth and the first decade of the fifth century A.D. So we are able to compare the character and quality of six contemporaneous texts of the same genre and on the same topic. Augustine's *Commentary*, written in A.D. 394/5, is preceded by the ones of Marius Victorinus (not long after A.D. 362), the anonymous 'Ambrosiaster' (between A.D. 366 and 384), and Jerome (A.D. 386 or shortly thereafter) and is earlier than the ones of another anonymous author discovered by Hermann Josef Frede (between A.D. 396 and 405) and Pelagius (between A.D. 405/6 and 410).

Plumer prints the text of Johannes Divjak's edition in CSEL 84 (1971) without the *apparatus criticus* and adds his own very clear and comprehensible English translation. It contains a few (eight) reasonably justified changes in comparison with Divjak's Latin text where P. does not make the 'corrections' (238); so we have in eight passages an English text which is different from the Latin. But the book explicitly does not claim to provide a critical edition, and this may be the reason for this shyness to alter the Latin text. The footnotes to the translation provide information for the reader of the Augustinian text.

A lot more analytical thought is produced in the five chapters of the extensive introduction where P. carefully expounds his view on the 'Date of Composition' of the *Commentary*, its 'Relation to the other Latin Commentaries in Late Antiquity', 'The Purpose of Augustine's Commentary', and 'Augustine as a Reader of Galatians'; ch. 5 states the 'Conclusions'. The book is well indexed. The table of contents does not list the many and instructive subtitles within the five chapters and is therefore not as helpful as it could be.

As P. maintains in ch. 2, Marius Victorinus' *commentatio simplex* of Paul's letter had the greatest impact on Augustine, especially since it was dealing with theological issues rather than giving learned philological and historical information. P. rightly emphasizes the important role of Marius Victorinus in Augustine's life according to the *Confessions*. Jerome's learnedness in the tradition of Origen and the 'variorum commentary' did not suit Augustine's 'pastoral purpose' (see below), but nevertheless his interpretation of *Gal* 2:11-14 (Paul's rebuke of Peter) provoked the famous dispute between Augustine and Jerome.

Ch. 3 on the purpose of the *Commentary* contains the book's most valuable observations. Augustine, P. maintains, was at that time reading Paul, not as in his later commentaries on Paul as a key to introspection and as a basis of abstract theological reflection, but 'chiefly as a guide to building community' (117). In the mid-390s he was interested in Pauline ethics which are concerned with humility and love as practised especially in the context of Christian correction, sincerity as opposed to hypocrisy (as expressed in Paul's rebuke of Peter), the antithesis of fear of the law and the life of faith motivated by the love of God. Discussing these issues the *Commentary* serves above all a pastoral purpose. According to P., Augustine had in mind both his fellow monks and his parishioners. The text was written only three or four years earlier than the monastic *Rule* (A.D. 397) whose principles of communal living are certainly older than the published text. There are in fact many parallels between the *Rule* and the Pauline directives discussed in the *Commentary*. P. can also point out a few references to pastoral problems Augustine had as a priest in Hippo (and would continue to have as bishop). There is also a polemical purpose explained by the fact that, at that time, the Catholics of Hippo were virtually a minority. P. detects a series of anti-Manichean and anti-Donatist elements, perhaps also anti-Arian and anti-pagan. In ch. 4, after offering some intelligent, but not innovative reflections on Augustinian hermeneutics, P. discusses some specifically Augustinian readings on Galatians. The essence of P.'s observations is neatly summarized in ch. 5, namely that the purpose of Augustine's *Commentary* is 'not merely to inform his audience but also to form them in the faith' (117).

All of P.'s arguments are compelling, even though they are to a large degree based on external evidence, namely information from Augustine's other writings (letters, other treatises, sermons, the *Psalm against the Donatists*); yet P.'s merit is to study the *Commentary* in its social, historical, and intellectual setting rather than its literary quality. One might criticize as a major weakness of P.'s book that he does not analyse Augustine's technique of commenting and the specific character of his single comments in comparison with the other five commentaries on Galatians. There is much recent literature on the commentary genre, its traditions, its variations in form and function (cf. the collections of articles edited by J. Assmann (1995), M. J. Edwards (1999), G. Most (1999), M.-O. Goulet-Cazé *et al.* (2000), R. K. Gibson/C. Shuttleworth/Kraus (2002), W. Geerlings/C. Schulze (2002 and 2003), and the monograph by Fiedrowicz (1998)), also particularly on Augustine's exegesis (ed. F. van Fleteren/J. C. Schnaubelt (2001)). P. ignores all this. But on the other hand, he opens a different perspective which is much more innovative than much of what has been written on the topic in recent years. P. discusses every problem very carefully and systematically, giving much interesting information and offering sound and never rash arguments, always considering pros and cons. Probably because this book was originally a doctoral dissertation, there is also much compilation, especially in the appendices. But every fact and argument is presented in a lucid language and well-wrought style. So we get a vivid and — as I believe — accurate picture of Augustine's priesthood, his intellectual background, and his aims and concerns.

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

THERESE FUHRER

M. JACOBSSON, *AURELIUS AUGUSTINUS: DE MUSICA LIBER VI. A CRITICAL EDITION WITH A TRANSLATION AND AN INTRODUCTION* (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis; Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 47). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2002. Pp. cxvii + 143. ISBN 91-22-01959-6; ISSN 0491-2764. Sw. kr. 239.00.

Augustine's *De musica* is his only surviving treatise in a projected series on the seven liberal arts. In the sixth and final book 'lies the profit of the previous ones' ('fructus illorum est', 8.3), where Augustine attempts to lead his reader from the consideration of earthly rhythms to the contemplation of eternal realities. Until now the *De musica* has not been given a critical edition, and all modern language translations of it have been based on the revised Maurist edition of 1836. Jacobsson's critical edition of Book 6 therefore fills an important need (one which will be more thoroughly met by his anticipated edition of all six books for the series *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*).

The first section of J.'s substantial introduction also serves as a helpful survey of the literature, and in his careful, balanced readings of the contributions of other scholars J. shows himself an astute and sharp-eyed critic. His introduction also includes detailed descriptions of the most important extant MSS, and the principles underlying his editorial process. In a particularly strong section of the book, J. treats textual problems on a line-by-line basis, discussing both textual variants and the decisions of previous editors lucidly and open-mindedly, and argues carefully for